

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

The Board convened in the Commissioners' Hearing Room, 6th Floor, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Commissioners Morris, Stanton, and Pridemore, Chair, present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Commissioners conducted the Flag Salute.

BID AWARD 2337

Reconvened a public hearing for Bid Award 2337 – Surveillance Vehicle. Allyson Anderson, General Services, read a memo from General Services requesting that Bid 2337, including Options B, C, D, E, F & G, be awarded to the lowest responsive bidder meeting all specifications. There being no public comment, **MOVED** by Stanton to award Bid 2337, including Options B, C, D, E, F & G, to Sirchie Finger Print Laboratories of Medford, New Jersey in the total bid amount of \$107,369.36, including Washington State sales tax, and to grant authority to the County Administrator to sign all related contracts. Commissioners Pridemore, Morris, and Stanton voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 25)

PUBLIC COMMENT

Speaker #1

Della Helmick, Vancouver, wanted to share with the Board that she and her family were going to be moving to Tucson, Arizona. Mrs. Helmick expressed thanks to the Board for everything she has learned about local government.

Speaker #2

Shawna Burkholder, Volunteer for Celebrate Freedom, thanked the Commissioners for their past support of the Marshall Leadership award. Ms. Burkholder noted that the nomination forms were now available, and that this was going to be the 15th year for selecting someone for the award process. Ms. Burkholder explained the selection criterion – someone with leadership potential; 35-years-old or younger; Clark County resident; and holds a 4-year degree. She further explained the benefits of the award recipient. She asked that the Board continue in their support and assist in advertising that the nomination forms are available. She added that the forms were due by August 29, 2003.

Speaker #3

Curtis Achziger, 3659 NE 85th St., Vancouver, referenced Commissioner Stanton's attendance at the recent FEMA training. Mr. Achziger stated that he is a member of the Civilian

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Emergency Response Team (CERT); however, he would be losing this certification because there is no way to recertify. He said there are 100 or more members and that the only way to recertify was to go back through the basic program. He said that seemed like a waste of time and money. Achziger pointed out that in the first 72 hours of an emergency, the professionals would need all the civilian help they could get. He asked the Board if they could find out if those people who are going to lose their certification could be recertified.

Stanton asked Mr. Achziger to clarify his comments – was he saying that he thinks they should recertify those people who are currently CERT members?

Achziger said they should be putting new people through the basic program – not filling it up with people who have already gone through it.

Pridemore asked how long certification lasted.

Achziger said he believed it was 2 years.

Stanton stated that she would follow up on the issue.

CONSENT AGENDA

Morris noted that there were some requested changes to the consent agenda. She explained that for item 15 there was a request to pull the minutes for July 1, 2003, and that there was a substitute page for item 11.

There being no public comment, **MOVED** by Morris to approve items 1 through 21, with the revision to item 11, and pulling the minutes of July 1, 2003 from item 15. Commissioners Pridemore, Morris, and Stanton voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 25)

PUBLIC HEARING: ROAD VACATION, NE 39TH AVENUE & NE 91ST STREET

Held a public hearing to consider the County Engineer's Report on the advisability of vacating a constructed portion of right-of-way known as NE 39th Avenue and a portion of unconstructed right-of-way known as NE 91st Street.

Louie Benedict, Department of Public Works, presented the staff report.

Morris stated that there was a subdivision that had been approved – Buckman Gardens – that was apparently never built. She said that as conditions of approval, the two pieces were dedicated...that property has changed hands and there is another subdivision proposal – was that correct?

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Benedict said yes.

Kay Johnston, 3806 NE 94th Street, Vancouver, stated that her house was not on 94th Street, but was on 38th Avenue. She stated that she is not referenced on any of the maps that she has seen. She explained where she should be located on the map. Ms. Johnston said she did not receive notification of the meeting. She said that vacating 39th Avenue and making a maze that would go around would affect her more so than some of the other residents. She expressed opposition to the road vacation.

Morris asked Ms. Johnston how she currently got in and out.

Johnston answered that she comes down 38th Avenue to 94th Street, takes a left and goes down to 39th Avenue, and then takes a right and comes out to 88th Street.

Benedict referenced Map #5, which shows the new circulation plan. He said that Ms. Johnston would be to the north of NE 94th Street on 38th.

Johnston reiterated that even though her address is on 94th Street, she is not receiving any mailings from the county.

Pridemore asked Mr. Benedict what their policy was on advertising.

Benedict said they covered quite an extensive area, including the northern part up where Ms. Johnson lives. He said they included a lot of people and apologized that Ms. Johnston didn't receive her notice.

Pridemore asked Benedict if it was 500 feet...1,000 feet (for people to receive notification).

Benedict said that normally everyone who accesses a road that will be vacated receives a notice. He added that he posted many of the orange colored signs regarding the hearing, and that the notice was also published in the newspaper.

Ivan Zanetti, 8904 NE 39th Avenue, Lot #3, Vancouver, asked for clarification on how he would be impacted by the road vacation. Mr. Zanetti said his property had previously been impacted by the two homes behind him – Lots #1 and #2. He said a significant amount of his property was taken away for easements and right-of-ways.

Morris asked Mr. Zanetti if he had been paid for it.

Zanetti said no.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Benedict replied that the road vacation does not take in that portion of his lot, but according to the circulation pattern of the plat, 40th Avenue will be entering that portion of county road on 39th Avenue that remains. So one route for traffic from the subdivision would go down 39th Avenue by Mr. Zanetti's home.

Zanetti asked if they would be cutting the road further back on his side.

Benedict said that as far as he knows there would be no development or improvements on 39th Avenue, so it would remain as is.

Morris asked when the 39th Avenue improvement had been done.

Zanetti said the late 1990's.

Morris said her understanding was that 39th is often used as a thru street for people to the north who want to access 88th, but that it's not a fully improved street and not intended to be used as a neighborhood circulator. She asked if that was correct.

Steve Schulte, Department of Public Works, said that Mr. Zanetti's access would stay as it currently is.

Zanetti said he wanted to know if any more of his lot line on the east side was going to be taken away.

Schulte said no. He explained that 39th Avenue does have a deficient cross section as well as a vertical curve problem. He explained that one of the reasons for the curvilinear approach was to reduce the amount of straight roadway out there and put more curvilinear roadway in, which would reduce volumes, cut-thru traffic, and speed. He said as a result they would see volume reduction and safety improvement.

Morris asked Mr. Schulte if he knew who had built the road.

Schulte said it is a local access roadway that has been maintained by the county.

Glen Wilcox, 8911 NE 39th Avenue, Vancouver, stated that his was the last house before the Fairfield Plan Development. Mr. Wilcox referenced the map where it says "removable bollards" on 40th Avenue. He asked for clarification.

Randy Printz, 915 Broadway, Vancouver, Attorney representing the applicant, stated that the applicant had originally proposed the bollards with the preliminary plat approval for the subdivision. He said that staff elected not to have the bollards in order to allow for some trips to continue down 39th Avenue. As a result, they were taken out. He said that Mr. Wilcox was

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

looking at the original preliminary application and that what has been approved does not include the bollards.

Wilcox referenced the vertical curve where there is limited sight access and asked if that area would be shaved down.

Schulte said the problem with the vertical curve is that there is limited sight distance, which results in a safety problem. He said that with the curvilinear approach there would not be any vertical curve problems. He said the subdivisions would be built with flatter roadways so that they don't have the sight distance issues.

There was brief discussion regarding 39th Avenue.

Schulte stated that staff believes that the entire curvilinear roadway section was going to be safer than what is currently there. He said it would be safest when the subdivision is completed and the circular roadway is put in because then the roadway coming out to the south onto 88th Street would no longer be deficient – it will be built without the sight distance problems. *Schulte* further explained.

Kathleen Staley, 8811 NE 39th Avenue, Vancouver, stated that currently her house and surrounding road is being flattened by land movers and vibrators. She said it is destroying the corner, e.g. a truck came around the corner and tore out the stop sign. Mrs. Staley said the road is in very bad shape. She asked if the county would be handling the clean-up after the construction.

Benedict said that according to the requirements of the plat, the developer would have to provide a continuous circulation pattern (referenced on sheet #3) for the people living on 94th and north of 94th. They will have access to 88th Street during construction. He said that for 39th Avenue by Mrs. Staley's house, they have a capital improvement project that would be improving the intersection there.

Staley said there is an ivy bush and fence along the side of her yard and that it has always been unclear as to what part is hers and what part is the easement.

Benedict explained that stakes are placed in order to help visualize where the county right-of-way ends and the property owners' property line begins.

Staley said she wondered how long they would have to deal with all of the construction.

Morris said it will most likely take a number of years for completion because it is a phased development.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Pridemore asked Benedict when 88th Street was supposed to be improved, and what were the plans for 39th Avenue.

Morris commented on future development in Clark County. She said they do try to plan improvements to roads when necessary, but they don't always have the money to do it. She said at some point in time 88th Street and that whole neighborhood, once it's built out, will stabilize; however, between now and then it would be foolish to try and promise that there will be anything other than continual change.

Staley said she wondered if anyone knew an approximate timeframe for when 88th Street would be widened.

Kevin Gray, Department of Public Works, said they were currently in the design phase for the 88th Street widening. He said at the very earliest, construction would not begin until 2006; however, due to financial constraints and funding, it was currently not programmed until 2008.

Staley asked for clarification whether upon completion of the new housing tract their road would be non-accessible to the public...would be a dead-end.

Pridemore said that as Mr. Printz had referred to earlier, that would not be the case – that 40th Avenue would still link up to 39th.

Staley said if there is going to be a park she would like to see it dedicated to the memory of Jay Kennedy.

Jackie Unger, 3411 NE 94th Street, Vancouver, expressed several concerns. She said the way it currently is she wondered how many houses and kids playing in the street they all would have to bypass in order to get out. She questioned where the cut-thru traffic was coming from. Ms. Unger referenced the property north of 94th that had been sold by Eric Beck. She said a subdivision is going to be constructed; however, several residents of the neighborhood have shut the job down because there has been no water out there, which has resulted in a lot of dust. She also stated that a home that supposedly had asbestos was torn down without Haz Mat or water onsite. She noted that they have talked to many people regarding this. Unger said there are plates across the road at the bottom of the hill on 39th Avenue, which is difficult for a regular automobile to drive over. Unger said that off 88th and 39th to the north, plus 94th to the west, there is a mile or more of substandard asphalt that has been practically destroyed in places due to three major projects. She said the county and builders have forced people to live in a lesser state than they previously lived in due to current activity in their area. Unger said she is wondering what's in store for those living at the end of 94th Street.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Morris said it would be misleading to say that anything other than significant development was going to take place. She recognized the inconvenience this has caused and apologized. She said this (development) is what the comprehensive plan calls for.

Unger reiterated that she understands that she cannot stop the development, but expressed frustration regarding the lack of dust control.

Morris said it is clearly something they need to be more mindful of as far as enforcement.

Unger said it would be nice if someone from the county would come out during the height of construction to see exactly what the residents are experiencing.

Diane Smith, 3609 NE 91st Street, Vancouver, stated that she was present on behalf of many of her neighbors who could not attend the hearing. Ms. Smith read a letter that she had addressed to Mr. Benedict. In essence, the letter collectively stated that they do not want to see 91st Street become a thru-street to the new development of Fairfield, just north of 88th Street.

Pridemore said *Unger* also wants to have it blocked, as the development approval states – she wants no traffic from any of the folks in front of her house...

Unger said the road would have to be greatly improved, and that the intersection is terrible trying to get off 34th Avenue onto 88th Street due to poor sight distance.

Pridemore indicated that *Florence Afoigue* had signed the party of records sign-in sheet. However, it was determined that she was actually there for the hearing regarding the Road Improvement Reimbursement Area.

Florence Afoigue, commented that she has approximately 8 acres of property that is zoned commercial and that they are paying the commercial tax. She explained that she has a house there and will not be developing the property. She wanted to know if she would be impacted as far as more taxes.

Steve Schulte, Department of Public Works, suggested that they step aside and he would answer her questions.

Curtis Achziger, Vice-President of the Northeast Hazel Dell Neighborhood Association, said he wanted to look at the overview rather than this one project. He referenced a map showing six different subdivisions and three infills that are in the basin. Mr. Achziger pointed out five different ways to get out of the basin. He then talked about the subdivision to be developed and referred to a poor exit coming out 39th, which is the one he really wanted to discuss. Achziger submitted pictures to the Board. He said that 39th would be maintained by the county as an exit. He said that the Association felt that this was a case of good money chasing bad money down a

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

tube. He said there are three poor exists and said he had proposals about how to get two good ones out of the three. He suggested blocking off 39th, making it a road for just the people who live in the general area. He further explained. Achziger said the argument at Fairfield's final hearing was that they needed for a possibility of additional traffic to the south. He said that 41st and 39th are so close together, if you're going to have left-hand turners coming from the west, they are going to stack up against each other. The traffic on 88th Street is so great, between Costco and Wal-Mart, that people would not be able to go across with those two roads so close together.

(The Commissioners microphones stopped working at this point...)

Achziger continued with his comments, stating that they would have then a 54-foot right-of-way at 41st to the south, a 54-foot right-of-way through Maplegate to the west, and a 54-foot right-of-way going north through Buckman Gardens. He said there are so many problems with 39th Street as far as the vertical curves. Achziger said he has pictures that show that there is still a vertical curve on 39th at the part the county wants to maintain, and also on 88th Street to the east that at least partially blocks the vision of people coming off of 39th Avenue.

Morris pointed out that what the Board was looking at was a road vacation issue and that the proposal was to, in fact, vacate NE 91st Street and NE 39th Avenue. She further clarified. Morris said that citizens are commenting about long-time, significant irritations about county maintenance of roads, developer compliance with dust control requirements, etc. They are also hearing about traffic problems along 88th Street, as well as Mr. Achziger's circulation plan with ways to get through the basin. Morris said she would like to schedule a meeting between Ms. Unger and some of the other folks who live in the area, along with county Code Enforcement and Transportation Department personnel, to go through each problem, drive out to the areas, and see what they can do to make life better during the next 10 years of continued growth in the area.

Achziger stated that on 34th Avenue there had been talk about the drainage problem and the problems to the east that has the sharp fall off of that. He referenced the stormwater situation and stated that it was going to have to be re-designed and re-installed in order to meet the standards. He said that according to a staff person from Code Enforcement, it is still being worked on. Achziger concluded by reiterating that the NE Hazel Dell Neighborhood Association would like to see 39th blocked off at the point of it being vacated.

Anthony Gomez, 9014 NE 39th Avenue, Vancouver, stated that there was poor visibility onto 88th Street as well as 34th Avenue, which has been addressed in previous hearings. He said both of the exits that would be accessed by removing the bollards would bring up some safety concerns and a lot of traffic onto roads that aren't made to take it at this point. Mr. Gomez said that what he was hearing was that 39th Avenue would be access all the way into the subdivision.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Stanton said that right now what they understood was that 91st Street would not have access to 34th...

Gomez said 37th Avenue would not have access to 91st Street – that was the plan; 40th Avenue would have access onto 39th Avenue, which is a difficult way of getting in and out of there.

Kelly Brown, 3509 NE 94th Street, Parcel 3 of 5, stated that she would welcome a meeting in order to discuss concerns. She said that repair of 39th Avenue can't wait. She said it is going to need constant repair during the process of construction due to constant traffic. She expressed concern regarding access for Emergency vehicles during the construction, as well as upon completion. Ms. Brown also explained her concerns regarding traffic flow on NE 94th Street. She asked what the timeline was for 41st Avenue to go through, and when 39th Avenue would be vacated. She asked if there were any proposed exits to 88th Street, besides 41st.

Morris commented (not audible).

Brown brought up the point of 94th Street connecting to 94th Way. As Mr. Achziger pointed out, there is a fire barricade there that will be opened if the vertical curve on 39th is taken care of. She further explained and suggested that the fire barricade remain as it is.

The Board convened for a short break.

Printz stated that upon originally proposing this project, a great deal of time was spent with county staff working on a circulation plan for the entire area. He said that 39th Avenue is a substandard road and, in fact, three previously approved projects to the north actually have conditions of approval that require some work to 39th in terms of taking down some of the vertical curves. Mr. Printz said that one of the things urban planners have tried to encourage in the development community in recent years is to try and come up with creative ways for neighborhood circulation plans that don't have cut-through traffic, etc. He said this is one of those plans. Printz addressed Mr. Zanetti, who had testified earlier, and told him that no additional right-of-way would be needed from him. Printz said that one of the big issues was whether there would be any bollards placed at the north end of 39th Avenue. He said the neighborhood association and developer strongly agreed on that proposal, which was in the original proposal. He said it is a county decision about whether or not to put bollards there. He said they would certainly encourage the bollards there, which would allow for emergency access, but not additional traffic through what is a substandard road. Printz noted that the project does have a separate construction entrance to the site and that contractors are encouraged to use it. He added that they had tried to dedicate the park to Vancouver-Clark Parks & Recreation; however, they didn't have the necessary funds to maintain it. Printz said there are bollards at the east end of what would be the vacated portion of 91st.

Pridemore asked Mr. Printz what the range was for lot sizes.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Printz said it's a PUD...

Unidentified man stated that it's attached at about 2,000 sq.-ft.; small unit detached at 3,300 sq.-ft.; and the bottom portion is zoned R-18.

Printz added that it's single-family, multi-family, and they've done a PUD to try and mix the densities.

Zanetti stated that he was in favor of putting the bollards in at the entrance of 40th & 39th Avenue in order to alleviate the traffic because there is a sight distance issue.

There was no further public comment.

Morris said there seemed to be agreement from everyone in terms of the bollards. She asked legal council if they would just suggest to staff that it's a good idea – not act on it at this hearing.

Stanton said the only other clarification was regarding the issue of whether 91st Street would ever go through and where it's currently proposed to be vacated. She said if and when the property to the west of that was ever to develop, she could see the street opening as part of the full circulation for the area. *Stanton* said that if staff can't find a good reason to not have the bollards, she would also support the idea because of concerns about sight distance and adequacy of 39th on the south end. She said the circulation makes sense to her.

Steve Schulte, Department of Public Works, addressed the bollard question on 39th Avenue where the curvilinear street starts. He said staff was not in favor of having bollards or a barricade there because that would allow two streets coming out onto 88th Street. He explained that not putting a bollard in allows two north/south streets and that traffic would be better distributed out onto 88th Street.

Pridemore thanked Commissioner *Morris* for taking on the responsibility of looking more closely at the area. He said this has gone through the development review process and the strict question before the Board was whether or not they vacate a road where the development of housing has already been approved. He added that he was also interested in looking at the bollards issue, as well as getting staff out there to deal with the immediate issues related to construction.

MOVED by *Morris* to accept staff's recommendation to vacate portions of NE 39th Avenue and NE 91st Street as indicated on the map and as recorded as a part of conditions of approval for the planned unit development. Commissioners *Pridemore*, *Morris*, and *Stanton* voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 26)

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

PUBLIC HEARING: ROAD IMPROVEMENT REIMBURSEMENT AREA 2003-01

Held a public hearing to consider the establishment of Road Improvement Reimbursement Area 2003-01. This proposed Reimbursement Area would be established in accordance with Clark County Code Chapter 12.36 (Road Improvement Reimbursement). A Resolution relating to the Sufficiency of the Reimbursement Area proposal was adopted by the Board of County Commissioners on May 27, 2003. (Note that existing residences and business would not be assessed a reimbursement charge unless those properties were to go through a redevelopment process and generate additional traffic.)

The proposed Reimbursement Area would be east of Interstate 5 in the Salmon Creek area of the County. The area would be irregular in shape but extends as far north as NE 179th Street, as far east as NE 50th Avenue, as far south as the Salmon Creek waterway, and as far west as Interstate 5. The establishment of the Reimbursement Area was requested by Legacy Health Systems, which is in the process of developing a hospital complex south of NE 139th Street in Salmon Creek. As a part of their development approval, Legacy was required to construct NE 23rd Avenue between NE 134th Street and NE 139th Street. Clark County code allows developers to recover some of their costs of constructing public roadways from future developers that would benefit from the improvements. As previously stated, existing residences and businesses not planning to redevelop and already approved developments would not be assessed a reimbursement charge.

Steve Schulte, Department of Public Works, presented three overheads – 1) Outline of the boundaries in the Salmon Creek area; 2) Key Elements of the proposal. He noted that the resolution had been revised to add item F. He further explained. He referred to the last overhead – 3) Hypothetical developments within the geographical area. He said they wanted to illustrate what the traffic impact fee charges would be, what the proposed latecomer charge would be, and what the percentage of the latecomer charge to the TIF would be. Schulte referenced the 2nd page of the staff report, under the Policy Implication section, and said the concern is that both the underlying state statute and the county ordinance require latecomers to have constructed the improvement had the firstcomer not. He said the question is would the latecomers that they are proposing to assess have had to construct 23rd had Legacy not done so. He said staff can't definitively find that they would or wouldn't have and as a result, staff has not made a recommendation on this particular request. Schulte stated that Legacy was requesting a one-month continuance and staff supported that in order to allow for continued research into the legal issues.

Rich Lowry, Prosecuting Attorney's Office, said he took another look at the latecomer's statute, which has a provision that is not reflected in the county implementing ordinance. He said that provision reads – "An Assessment Reimbursement Area shall be formulated by the city, town, or county based upon a determination by the city, town, or county of which parcels adjacent to the improvements would require similar street improvements upon development."

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

He said they also appear to have an adjacency requirement in the state's statute, which appears to make the proposal very problematic. Lowry said he would also support a continuance in order to allow Legacy to respond to the issues.

Charles Dean, Titan Realty Group, 400 East Evergreen Boulevard, Suite 105, Vancouver, stated that he was speaking on behalf of his parents, Raymond and Henrietta Dean, as well as some of the neighbors who reside on NE 38th Street. Mr. Dean said that many of the existing residential homes have been zoned commercial for many years and can only be zoned as commercial because they're not marketable as residential. He said most of them are larger than 10,000 sq.-ft. and if someone wants to sell their home their property will immediately be devalued by having the reimbursement to Legacy. He further explained. Dean said that Legacy should be held accountable and pay the full brunt. He explained that one of the main problems in that area is the I-5/I-205 interchange – it has a major impact in terms of traffic tie up and needs to be addressed. He said Legacy is the main beneficiary and current property owners should not have to pay for Legacy to come in.

Stanton asked Mr. Dean how big the residential properties are that he is referring to.

Dean said up to ½ acre.

Lynn Valenter, Director of Finance and Operations, Washington State University-Vancouver, stated that their property (WSU) was in the proposed latecomer reimbursement area for NE 23rd Avenue. She said they do not support a latecomers charge as related to Legacy's request for \$750,000 of reimbursement. Ms. Valenter made four points – 1) The proposed latecomer fee steps outside of the Clark County transportation policy, granting priority to designated arterial routes; 2) Additional charges may hamper economic development, raising the cost for family-wage employers to consider developing within the area; 3) Regarding the traditional use of latecomers fees, typically the latecomer who was being assessed would have needed to develop what wasn't developed to be charged, i.e. they're reimbursing something they would have had to do otherwise. She said in this case it seems unlikely that any latecomers would be required to build the NE 23rd improvement, and since it wasn't in the six-year road plan, it's even more unlikely to have been required for subsequent development; 4) In regards to the assessment, why should all trips generated onto NE 23rd Avenue be subject to a latecomers fee when some of those trips may bring direct benefit to Legacy. Valenter said that under current agreements Washington State University-Vancouver would not be required to pay the proposed latecomers fees; however, they don't believe that adopting the latecomer fees would best serve the public interest.

Kevin Jolma, Battle Ground School District, thanked Mr. Schulte for the addition of item "F" regarding concurrency exemption and said that Battle Ground School District would be exempt from the latecomer's fee because of being a K-12. He said the 23rd extension is not in their district, it's outside of their boundaries.

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Duane Bryant, NE 22nd Avenue, asked why Legacy should be exempt from doing their part in building the roads when they're a profit making organization. He said all of the other commercial businesses or developers have to put their two cents in on the road system or they can't develop – why should they be penalized? Mr. Bryant said that the small piece of 23rd Avenue would only benefit people who live on 139th because most people use 29th Avenue and come onto 134th.

Randy Cantenwine, commented on the size of the area and said that it's much larger than common sense would dictate for this sort of reimbursement process. He echoed what Mr. Bryant had stated in regards to people in their area not utilizing 23rd Avenue. He said the increase in traffic that the hospital is going to generate could actually be a detriment and reduce the value of their properties after development. He said it was clear that the development of 23rd is just for the hospital and will obviously benefit any associated businesses, such as doctor offices and clinics, etc. He said he didn't view this as being a reasonable proposal.

There was no further public comment.

Pridemore closed the public comment, but noted that they were anticipating additional comment at the next scheduled hearing on the matter.

Morris commented that it was worthwhile for everyone to remember that the whole corridor had been under a moratorium with absolutely no relief in site, so that anyone who owned property could do nothing with it. She said that one of the benefits Legacy is bringing to that corridor is their commitment to do significant transportation improvements. She said for those people whose property is zoned commercial, the Board did a reservation plan so that commercial development would have first shot at the space that is in that corridor. She said Legacy opened up the opportunity for people who own commercial land in that area to be able to market it if they wish to. Morris added that it would be helpful to pay close attention to what the requirements are to even have to participate in the reimbursement.

Stanton said she did agree with some of the comments made, in particular the one regarding the size of the area and whether it is appropriate, but that is a question for another time. She said they do have some significant legal issues to address in the next month.

MOVED by Stanton to continue the public hearing regarding the Road Improvement Reimbursement Area 2003-01 to 10:00 a.m., August 19, 2003. Commissioners Pridemore, Morris, and Stanton voted aye. Motion carried. (See Tape 26)

Hearing Reconvened at 2 p.m. for a Bid Opening

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Present at the bid opening: Louise Richards, Clerk of the Board, and Allyson Anderson and Priscilla Ricci, General Services Department.

BID OPENING 2339

Held a public hearing for Bid Opening 2339 – Tri-Mountain Golf Course Grounds Maintenance Equipment. Allyson Anderson, General Services, opened and read bids. Anderson said it was their intention to award Bid 2339 on July 29, 2003, at 10:30 a.m., in the Commissioners' hearing room of the Clark County Public Service Center, 6th Floor. (See Tape 26)

COMMISSIONERS PROCEEDINGS
JULY 22, 2003
CLARK COUNTY, WASHINGTON

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Craig A. Pridemore/s/
Craig A. Pridemore, Chair

Betty Sue Morris/s/
Betty Sue Morris, Commissioner

Judie Stanton, Commissioner

ATTEST:

Louise Richards/s/
Clerk of the Board

rt